

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2474 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-68 Year-2024 Thana- LARJHAGHAT District- Samastipur

1. Ramchandra Sah @ Ram Chandra Sah @ Ramchandar Sahu, aged about 56 years, Sex - Male, son of Late Shivrindan Sah @ Shivrindan Sahu,
 2. Ramsharan Sah @ Ram Sharan Sah @ Ram Sharan Sahu, aged about 58 years, Sex - Male, son of Late Shivrindan Sah @ Shivrindan Sahu
 3. Ramdial Sah @ Ramdial Sah, aged about 52 years, Sex - Male, son of Late Shivrindan Sah @ Shivrindan Sahu
 4. Chandula Devi, aged about 47 years, Sex - Female, wife of Sri Ramchandra Sah @ Ram Chandra Sah @ Ramchandar Sahu
 5. Mukesh Sah @ Mukesh Kumar Sahu. aged about 43 years, Sex - Male, son of Yogendra Sah @ Yogendra Sahu,
 6. Sachin Kumar, aged about 23 years, Sex - Male, son of Sri Ramchandra Sah @ Ram Chandra Sah @ Ramchandar Sahu
 7. Pintu Sah @ Pintu Kumar Sah, aged about 40 years, Sex - Male, son of Ramanand Sah @ Ramnandan Sah
 8. Dilkhush Kumar @ Dilkhush Kumar, aged about 25 Years, Sex - Male, son of Sri Ramdial Sah @ Ramdial Sah
 9. Sunil Kumar @ Sunil Kumar Sah, aged about 30 years, Sex - Male, son of Sri Ramsharan Sah @ Ram Sharan Sah @ Ram Sharan Sahu
 10. Meera Devi @ Mira Devi, aged about 40 years, Sex - Female, wife of Manoj Sah @ Manoj Sahu.
- All are resident of Village-Belsandi, Ward No. 10, PS.- Larjharghat, District-Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manish Kumar No 13, Advocate Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate Mrs. Nitu Kumari, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Nikil Kumar Agrawal, Advocate Mr. Keshav Bhardwaj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Anant Kumar 1, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 11-05-2026 Heard Mr. Manish Kumar No 13, learned counsel

 appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Anant Kumar 1,

 learned APP for the State.



2. The petitioners seek pre-arrest bail in connection with Larjhaghat P.S. Case No. 68 of 2024 corresponding to G.R. No. 1193 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 109(1), 74, 303(2), 352, 351(2), (3) of the BNS.

3. As per the allegations made in the FIR, the petitioners were illegally raising construction over the land of the informant, and when the informant and her family members protested against the same, the petitioners had allegedly assaulted them, causing injuries.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that petitioners are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. Specific allegation of assaulting the husband of the informant is against petitioner no. 1. General and omnibus allegation has been levelled against the other petitioners. Injuries sustained by the informant side have been opined by the doctor to be simple in nature. Petitioners have clean antecedent. On these grounds, petitioners seek to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail.



6. Having heard the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well as, considering the fact that general and omnibus allegation has been levelled against petitioners no. 2 to 10, they are directed to be released on pre-arrest bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned District Court within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned District Court where the case is pending, in connection with Larjhaghat P.S. Case No. 68 of 2024 corresponding to G.R. No. 1193 of 2024, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

7. So far as petitioner no. 1 is concerned, considering the fact that specific allegation against him that he had assaulted the husband of the informant on his head by means of iron rod causing injury, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner no. 1 on pre-arrest bail.

8. However, the petitioner no. 1, if so advised, may surrender before the learned District Court and seek regular bail. In that case, the learned District Court may consider to disposed of the bail application of the petitioner no. 1 on the same day on the basis of material which has come in course of investigation.



9. The learned District Court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners no. 2 to 10 as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. If any other case is pending against the petitioners no. 2 to 10 as what has been stated in paragraph no. 3, this order will lose its force automatically.

10. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

